Copy

Hal Verb
P.O. Box 421815
San Francisco, CA 94142-1815

Sept. 14, 2000

The Fourth Decade
ATTN: Jerry D. Rose
State University College
Fredonia, N.Y. 14063

Dear Jerry:

I'm enclosing my check for renewal on "Fourth Decade" for another year.

I finished reading the entire issue & will make some brief comments here but, first, I noticed that lately you've not been putting in your readers' comments on articles. Any reason? It helps me to see where the "research community" is going because I think we all need to look at ourselves and ask if the research is being advanced or not.

The reason I make this latter point is that I was totally (and I mean totally-to emphasize my feelings) dismayed by the article "How Did Zapruder Know", by Joseph Scovitch, of whom I have never heard since this is the first time I've seen his name.

I think Scovitch's piece borders on the same lines as the Zapruder film and body alteration theories. (In fact, it may even be worse than those but the fact of the matter is that his theme of "How" Mr. Z won't

get as much play as the Fetzer, Trowman & Lifton supporters will get. I believe the future will prove me correct on this point).

There are so many "what ifs", "linkages", "did he or didn't he" in these many pages by Scovitch (a total of 7 to 22 pages equalling 16 pages in all) it may overwhelm the novice to the Kennedy assassination but it cannot possibly impress those with a long and very detailed knowledge of the Zapruder film. Can you possibly entertain a thought, Jerry, as to what Weisberg and Wrone (often cited in Scovitch's text and in the references at the end) will think of this dreadful scenario?? I shudder to think!

There are a few points I'll raise and let us see if any rational person can hold to them as, no doubt, Scovitch has. For example, Scovitch would have us believe that the Z-film was allowed to take place and then allowed to exist. Oh, I know, there'll be many who will say - "yes but the conspirators altered it to show no conspiracy!" I've spoken and written (in your publication, in fact) about the illogicality of this in that even if it were altered (a notion I do not remotely even suggest) the conspirators left in evidence leading to conspiracy. So, okay, you have some rather dumb conspirators who can get away with a crime for nearly 40 years and probably forever but are just dumb enough to lead some researchers to a conclusion of conspiracy (weighing the Zapruder film with other evidentiary matters -

a point totally overlooked by all supporters of alteration (film/body)—that is why I underlined the "with other evidentiary matters." If anyone fails to understand what is meant by this they are in no position to claim a full understanding of what the Zapruder film is all about. From reading Scovitch's piece I'd gather that he is in no position to make a claim of understanding what the Z-film reveals and what it cannot reveal. (On this latter point = I do not, by any means, mean to imply that what the Z-film does not reveal is to be taken to mean 'but, thus, the film was altered not to reveal something. No— this is a profound (I wish I could use a stronger word but this will do for the time being) misreading & misunderstanding of seeing the film for what it is.

You may be interested in knowing that Wrone will be putting out a book next year on the history of the Z-film. Part of it will be devoted to totally (I wish I could, again, use a stronger word) demolishing the Z-film alteration bunkette (not my word but I use it appropriately here) with the body alteration nonsense left in a state of utter ruin.

By the way since I mentioned what would Weisberg & Wrone think of this Scovitch piece I'll be sending both a copy of the Scovitch effort. Whether they'll reply is up to them.

Just to mention a few little "gems" I picked out in the Scovitch article note where

Scovitch comments that "Liebeler did not even elict this point" (about Zapruder standing on a perch because he felt he was "to short to film"). Zapruder's comment is taken from Manchester's book which appeared in 1961 Liebeler interviewed Mr. Z in 1964. How could Liebeler know three years later Manchester would make this very point? Did Liebeler have "foreknowledge" too - can he read the future? We already have enough data on Liebeler's hindsight but Scovich seems to now wonder why Liebeler didn't use his amazing gift of reading the future??! (all this cited appears on page 18 of the Scovitch effort).

I've been often to that perch area & stood on it myself many times. It is a pretty ideal spot for someone who is both short and for one suffering from vertigo (Sitzman personally told me she held on to Zapruder quite tightly because of his vertigo).

Apart from that after Scovitch tells us that (see page 9) that "how" Z got his location was "almost (MY EMPHASIS) a case of planted misinformation" and then in the very next sentence goes about planting more (seeds of destruction?) by stating: "It would seem that only some verbal source held this information, and then relayed it to Zapruder to those around him" (again, my emphasis). I might ask Scovitch, "how does your garden grow?!"

A smile came to my face when in the latter part of this paragraph he terms this as a "curious sub-factoid". What the heck is a "sub-factoid"? A fact is a fact is a fact & you don't need a Gertrude Stein to be able to understand that!!

As I was reading this charming essay by Scovitch I kept asking myself (but did Scovitch ask her) what about the other film photographers which included movie, still + Polaroid and there may have been even a tape recording existing. Were all these "told" where to stand?? And, if not, why not? Can we get a straight answer on this very point (please - no "sub-factoids"). I raised this very point when I spoke together with Josiah Thompson in Dallas in November, 1998. Was Scovitch present or not? If he wasn't present then he most likely saw the Zapruder video of that November meeting. And I am on it! Did Scovitch forget to see and hear what I had to state about debunking the film alteration nonsense. And if he did hear what I said what is his reply?

Although it is clear in my mind that Mr. Scovitch really hasn't looked at the Z-film (& I have many, many times) with an eye for seeing exactly what he is observing it became very obvious to me when he stated (see page 10) that "gunfire erupted, initially missing the limousine, by most accounts." Again, this is something I've written and spoken about (and, again, in November, 1998 in Dallas). As far back as 1994 I demonstrated factually (no "sub-factoids" here) that "most accounts" are totally erroneous as to the first shot missing. (Twyman never, ever, answered my arguments published in "The Fourth Decade" showing how hopelessly in error he was when he, too, like Scovitch, agreed with this "by most accounts.") If Scovitch wants to continue to believe in this "first shot missing" scenario he can do so but I and others will find that anything he writes has to be questioned solely on a lack of evidence to support his fanciful notions.

There is a lot more but I really tried to keep this brief - really, I did but there was so much in this article I could not simply take.

I think the title of the article, "HOW DID ZAPRUDER KNOW?" is totally misleading and misdirects the attention of researchers into areas not worthy of effort. A thorough examination of the Zapruder film should be the real effort. A better title would've been "WHAT DOES THE ZAPRUDER FILM REALLY SHOW?". And I can say this because if Mr. Scovtch wants to persist in saying the first shot missed because he relies on what others erroneously report I cannot trust his judgement on what the Z-film does show. Scovtch may reasonably ask "HOW DOES MR. VERB KNOW?" and I'll be glad to fill in the details.

Sincerely,
Hal Verb

To call what D. wrote "over-ripe garbage" is a fraud. It is based on a fabrication given to be wrong and baseless in the first disclosed records. There was no change in the officially approved movie-cable route. A newspaper artist, lacking the necessary space, eliminated the relatively large amount of space these extra turns in Houston & Elm would have required, intelligent Nuts. I raised questions about this in Whitewash in 1965. On this basis alone it is all childish, ugly- and hurtful-fiction. Tell Hal why Hal why I do not want to get involved now & his Gratuitous, misdirectionally crazy- and purposely ignorant

I do not recall anything more impossible, more stupid, more libelous or more revolting.

At Rose how he could find so much space for this hurtful filth and not find any for basic and factual books like mine

Rose's printing this without getting Lovich to remove the incorrect geography that is basic to it suggests it is because he has nothing else

And his own ignorance of the established fact